

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಭೀಮಣ್ಣ (ಭಾಲ್ಕಿ).—ಗುರಾಮ ಎನ್ನುವ ಪದದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಬಾಪೂಗೌಡರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಒಂದುಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಮನುಷ್ಯರನ್ನು ಎಕ್ಸಾಯ ಮಾಡಿ ಅವರನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಸೇವೆಗೆ ಐಟ್ವಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಗುರಾಮ ಎಂದು ಯಾವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದೋ ಆ ಸಂದರ್ಭಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕಂತೆ ಅರ್ಥ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಶ್ರೀ ಅಜೀಜ್ ಸೇಟ್ ಅವರು ನೌಕರರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ವಾಸ್ತವವಾಗಿ ಗುರಾಮ ಎನ್ನುವ ಅರ್ಥವೇ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಇದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅದು ಅನೌಪರ್ಲಮೆಂಟರಿಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

MR. SPEAKER.—I have been sufficiently educated about this matter. I request the hon. Members to spare me an hour's time to consider it. I reserve my ruling.

Privilege motion against Sri H. N. Nanje Gowda re : certain reflections made against the Chair

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, I rise to a point of order. During Question Hour I was raising on a point of order to raise a question of privilege. You directed me to raise it after the Question Hour.

Sri H. N. NANJE GOWDA.—Under Rule 311 (4),...

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಇಂಪೀಚೆಂಟ್ ಆಗಿರಬಾರದು. ಮತ್ತೊಬ್ಬರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಶಾಂತತೆಯಿಂದ ಕೇಳಬೇಕು.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—The point of privilege that I wanted to raise is based on the remarks made by the hon. Member Sri H. N. Nanje Gowda.

The hon. Member Sri Nanje Gowda has made the following observations : after the Speaker gave certain directions and was pleased to say when supplementaries were being asked that " This topic is discussed times out of number here. Therefore, next question." Then Sri Nanjegowda says as :

" Are we to think that the Chair is helping the Madras Government ? Government was in a fix and therefore you are shielding them. "

This is infringement of the privilege of the hon. Speaker. It casts certain reflections on the attitude of the hon. Speaker. Therefore, I feel that the hon. Member has committed breach of privilege of the Chair.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ನಾಗಪ್ಪ.—ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯ.....

MR. SPEAKER.—The member may speak when I call upon him. If I require any aid, I shall certainly get it from him. He need not assist me in shielding or protecting me. I am quite capable of interpreting rules and the words that are alleged to have been used by Sri Nanje Gowda. After hearing Sri Nanje Gowda, I will give my ruling and state what proceedings are to be taken. After hearing him, I shall look into the records.

Sri S. BANGARAPPA.—Is it not only a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is a motion for breach of privilege. Is it not?

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I stood on a point of order to draw your kind attention and I am seeking your consent for moving it as a motion of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I want to hear Sri Nanje Gowda and not Sri Bangarappa. The Member concerned is Sri Nanje Gowda. I am permitting only Sri Nanje Gowda to talk. It is not good for everybody to talk. I shall hear Sri Nanje Gowda now.

Sri H. N. NANJE GOWDA.—Sir, we know under Rule 311 (4).....

Mr. SPEAKER.—In the first instance, I want to know whether the member has used those words. I shall find out from the records. But the member may confirm it.

†Sri H. N. NANJE GOWDA.—A point of order is not a point of privilege. That also the hon. Minister must know.

I specifically put this question with a view to know the stand of the Government because many things are said, done regarding the Cauvery Basin. We know that even the hon. Chief Minister has admitted that the Government of India have not cared to consult the Government of Mysore when giving clearance to those six Projects which are to be built out of the purview of the Agreement. In this connection, I wanted to know many things from the Government. I wanted to know whether the Central Government were insisting upon the concurrence of Madras for Mysore projects and if that was not the case whether our Government had explained to the Government of India about the discrimination. I came to know that the Government of India had called for comments from the Government of Madras with regard to our projects in the Cauvery Basin. I am a very sincere man interested in the Cauvery Basin and therefore, I felt sorry for the Government's failure to utilise the Cauvery Basin fully. I also felt that the Government lacked statesmanship. In that state when I was full of feeling, I wanted to get some more information from the hon. Chief Minister. Even the public expected some answer from this Government. The people are asking. Why is the State keeping mum?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I want the Member's explanation on the words under question.

Sri H. N. NANJE GOWDA.—I am giving the background with the whole facts. The country is asking what is the Government doing when technical clearance is not given by the Centre. When I was informed that the Government of India had not consulted us for the Madras Project, that our projects were sent to Madras Government and that there was no technical clearance as yet for the projects of Mysore. I was very much moved. Under those feelings, I wanted to put some more questions. Just at that moment the Chair disallowed any more supplementaries and passed on to the next question. It is the responsibility of the Chair also to safeguard the interests of the state. This is

a very serious matter relating to several state projects. On this point of order and privilege, many minutes were wasted. If three or four minutes had been spent on that question, it would have been beneficially spent.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I want to know whether the member admits having used those words.

Sri H. N. NANJE GOWDA.—I do not remember now what I have stated. After verification from the records if the Chair says that I have uttered them, I will have to take it that I have uttered those words. At that time, my feelings were so much touched that I wanted to tackle this problem in all seriousness. Those feelings were against the inability of the Government and about the lapses of this Government.

Sri K. H. PATIL.—Was there any intention on the part of the hon. Member to cast reflection on the Chair?

Sri H. N. NANJE GOWDA.—Never. I never wanted to cast any reflection on the Chair. I was so much of feelings then. That is all.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಬಂಗಾರಪ್ಪ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ರೂಲ್ 311 ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಎತ್ತಿದರು. ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಎತ್ತಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೆಜ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ಪಾಡಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ ತಪ್ಪು ಅನುಮತಿಯನ್ನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೆಜ್ ಮೋಷನ್ 177 ರಿಂದ 183 ವರೆಗಿರುವ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ.

2-30 P.M.

Under the Rules notice of question of privilege has to be given and the consent of the Chair should be taken. The Hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs has not followed that procedure. Under rule 311 he has tried to attract the attention of the Chair and sought to move a motion of breach of privilege. I submit that is not the rule under which a motion for breach of privilege is to be moved; that is a rule dealing with points of order.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—The Hon. Minister has raised a question of privilege on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The procedure referred to in rules 177 to 179 applies to matters that occur outside the House. When they occur to the knowledge of everybody sitting here, whether it is not open to the Chair or to any hon. Member to raise a question of privilege without following those rules?

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, a point of order has been raised by the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs. A question of privilege can be raised on the floor of the House the moment a thing has occurred. There are several conventions and rulings on this point. The Hon'ble Minister has risen on a point of order and a point of order cannot be converted into a point of privilege. Rule 311 says that a point of order shall relate to the interpretation or enforcement of these rules or such articles of the Constitution, etc. Sub-rule (5) of the same rule also specifically says that a point of order is not a point of privilege. When

(SRI M. NAGAPPA)

the Hon'ble Minister has chosen to raise a point of order, he cannot later on convert it into a point of privilege. If he wants to raise a question of privilege, he has to give notice in writing to the Secretary. So, I submit that there is no force in the point of order, and the matter may be dropped for the present. If a motion comes, let us discuss it at the appropriate time.

SRI M. S. KRISHNAN.—I do not want to refer to what Sri Nagappa has already said. I want to refer to proviso to rule 180 which says:

“Provided further the Speaker may, if he is satisfied about the urgency of the matter, allow a question of privilege to be raised at any time during the course of a sitting after the disposal of questions.”

Probably the Hon'ble Minister may take recourse to this particular proviso and say that the matter is urgent and hence the Chair may take cognisance of it. My submission is that it is not a matter of urgency. If it had been a matter of urgency, the very same Minister would not have raised it as a point of order. He would straightaway have raised it as question of privilege. A question of privilege should be restricted to a specific matter of recent occurrence and it must be derogatory to the House. Then only it becomes a matter of urgency. Here there is no such urgency. After all, it is supposed to be a sort of reflection against the Chair which also is denied by the hon'ble Member Sri Nanje Gowda himself. He said clearly that he never meant any disrespect to the Chair. Therefore, I see no reason why the Chair should take cognisance of it.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, I am very happy that hon'ble Members have spoken at length on the point I have raised and thrown a lot of light. But I am sorry I have to disagree with the views that they have expressed. Firstly, I have raised a point of order and not a question of privilege. It is a point of order raised in order to attract the kind attention of the Chair so that I may get an opportunity to raise a question of privilege. At that stage, you were pleased to direct me to take an opportunity after the Question Hour. I have not raised any point of order which is against the rules or against the articles of the Constitution. It is a well-known accepted fact that no reflections shall be cast against any hon. Member of this House, much less against the Chair.

SRI K. H. PATIL.—We never intended any reflections against the Chair.

SRI K. PUTTASWAMY.—I do not contend that members would cast any reflection against the Chair, but sometimes it happens. I have taken the precaution of getting this verified before raising this point of privilege. The hon'ble member has made that statement. You may kindly verify from the record. It is for you to decide whether such

observations amount to reflections on the impartiality of the Chair. If that amounts to reflection on the impartiality of the Chair, I have no doubt in my mind that the Chair would come to the conclusion that it amounts to infringement of the privilege of the Speaker and the Chair would take necessary action in the matter. Therefore, may I request you to kindly give consent to me to make the motion regarding the point of privilege affecting the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I reserve the ruling. I shall give my ruling during the course of the day.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ (ಶ್ರವಣಬೆಳಗೊಳ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ತಾವು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ನಾನು ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನಂಜೇಗೌಡರು ಏನು ಒಂದು ಉದ್ದೇಶವನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದರೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಉತ್ತರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕಡೆಯಿಂದ ಬರಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನ ತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಉದ್ದೇಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಹೊರತು ಬೇರೆ ಯಾವ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದಲೂ ಅವರು ಅದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ಪೀರ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಏನು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನಂಜೇಗೌಡರು ಹೇಳಿದರು ಆ ಶಬ್ದಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರು ಉದ್ದೇಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಅವರು ಆ ಮಾತನ್ನು ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದು ಪಿಎರೇಜ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುವುದು ಬೇಡ. ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಗೌರವ ಇದೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನಂಜೇಗೌಡರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತಹ ಶಬ್ದ ಅನಪೇಕ್ಷಣೀಯ ಆಗಿದ್ದರೆ, ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅವರು ಅದನ್ನು ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let him know what exactly he has said. The Hon'ble Minister for Parliamentary Affairs says he has got it verified. I have not yet seen it. I shall find it out. The words attributed to the hon'ble member Sri Nanje Gowda are: "Are we to think that the Chair is helping the Madras Government? The Government was in a fix and therefore you are shielding them." If these words are there they have got a definite meaning. If he does not remember, let him find out from the record whether he has not said it. If they are there, he should unconditionally withdraw them and express regret.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, it is as if we are playing cricket and there is absolutely no bitterness. I have raised the point of privilege only with a view to see that we follow the correct procedures. That is all. Beyond that there is nothing in my mind. As far as the point that Sri Sivappa made out, if you come to the conclusion that there is a case, then I should be permitted to raise the point of privilege and then the other things may follow. Whatever ruling you may give, we will abide by that.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let the hon. member Sri Nanje Gowda find out what is the position. If the words are there, then I shall consider the request made by the Hon. Minister. In the meantime, if the hon. member Sri Nanje Gowda has to say anything, I shall consider that also and give my ruling. My view is that prima facie the words attributed by the hon. member are definitely reflections on the Chair.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನಂಜೇಗೌಡರು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಆದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮಾತುಗಳು ಏನಿವೆ, ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಅವರು ಬಹಳ ಉದ್ದೇಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಶಬ್ದಗಳು ಇದ್ದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I shall consider. If he wants, let him unconditionally withdraw and express regret.

Sri H. N. NANJE GOWDA.—As a new comer and as a young member in the Legislature I feel that an old and aged Speaker like you, is like my Grandpa and so if I have taken such liberty consciously or unconsciously it is out of love and affection to the Speaker and not with any bad intention. I do not remember what I have spoken, but presuming I have said that, I unconditionally withdraw those words and express regret.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I shall consider both the things.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಬಂಗಾರಪ್ಪ.—ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅದು ರೆಕಾರ್ಡ್ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಮುಂದೆ ತಾವು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಾ ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I shall give my ruling.

Point whether "Criminal waste of time" is parliamentary

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, yesterday I sent a motion regarding the words "criminal waste of the time of the House," used on the floor of the House. In this connection, I would invite the attention of the Chair to the proceedings of the House of the People, Vol. II page 1498 of 1952 wherein "wasting the time of the House" is held as unparliamentary and it is all the more so when it is said as "criminal waste of the time of the House." I submit that with reference to this ruling this expression may be ruled as unparliamentary and it should be expunged from the records. The member who used it should also withdraw it unconditionally and he should also express regret for it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The member will kindly pass on that authority to me.

Sri D. B. KALMANKAR.—Sir, your ruling on the point regarding privilege motion against Sri S. Nijalingappa may be given.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I shall give it at the end of the day.

Statement by the Minister for Law, Labour and Parliamentary Affairs
re : position of Questions tabled and Answers furnished by the Government.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, yesterday the hon. member Sri Nagappa raised a point and I promised to give information to this House regarding the position of questions and answers. Sir, so far out of 409 questions which are more than 15 days old, we have been able to furnish answers to 280 questions. Out of these 280 questions, 220 questions have been listed and answered on the floor of this House.